

2008

Diagnosing potential: preservice teachers' understanding and expectations of students with learning disabilities

Stuart Woodcock
University of Wollongong

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/theses>

University of Wollongong

Copyright Warning

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site.

You are reminded of the following: This work is copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part of this work may be reproduced by any process, nor may any other exclusive right be exercised, without the permission of the author. Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material.

Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

Unless otherwise indicated, the views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the University of Wollongong.

Recommended Citation

Woodcock, Stuart, Diagnosing potential: preservice teachers' understanding and expectations of students with learning disabilities, PhD, Faculty of Education, University of Wollongong, 2008. <http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/127>

NOTE

This online version of the thesis may have different page formatting and pagination from the paper copy held in the University of Wollongong Library.

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

COPYRIGHT WARNING

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site. You are reminded of the following:

Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material. Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

**Diagnosing Potential: Preservice Teachers' Understanding
and Expectations of Students with Learning Disabilities**

Diagnosing Potential: Preservice Teachers' Understanding and Expectations of Students with Learning Disabilities

Stuart Woodcock, B.A. (hons), QTS. Bton, M.Ed. (Special Education) UOW.

Volume I

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
University of Wollongong

Faculty of Education

June 2008

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY

This thesis reports the original work of the author, except as stated.
It has not been previously submitted for a degree at this or any other university.

Stuart Woodcock

June 2008

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge, with deep appreciation, Associate Professor Wilma Vialle, principal supervisor, University of Wollongong and Associate Professor Deslea Konza, associate supervisor, Edith Cowan University, for their valuable encouragement and guidance throughout my doctoral studies. Wilma and Deslea willingly offered support and critique at all stages of the doctorate. Their faith in me and this research shall never be forgotten.

Sincere thanks also to Russell Kay for the many precious hours that he spent guiding and critically supporting me with statistical support, analysing of the data and writing up of the methodology and results. There are no words that can express to him my gratitude and appreciation.

I am also grateful to the academic staff, and students, at the University of Wollongong, Charles Sturt University, and Macquarie University who were involved in or supported this study. Without their assistance, the research presented would not have been possible.

I wish to express appreciation to Beverley Lambert for the profuse hours that she spent proof-reading this thesis. I am most grateful for the support and comments I received. Thank you.

My indebtedness to my parents and immediate family, Violet and Wilton Howes, Sue Wilson, and dear friends who supported me in so many ways throughout my doctoral studies can never be erased. Without their love and assistance I would never have managed to reach this stage.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the support of staff of the Faculty of Education – Charles Sturt University. The support gained from the Faculty since 2004 has been unmeasurable, for which I am truly appreciative.

ABSTRACT

The current study was conducted to investigate preservice teachers' understandings and expectations of students with learning disabilities. Attributional responses that teachers construct result in differing teacher affect, evaluative feedback and expectation of future performance. Once these understandings and expectations are embedded they are less likely to change over the span of a teaching career. This study therefore examined preservice teachers' attributional responses to boys with a learning disability who had failed a class test. Preservice teachers' attitudes towards students with learning disabilities, and their teacher efficacy were also explored in relation to their attributional responses. The instructional strategies that preservice teachers report they would use for students with learning disabilities were also considered.

Six hundred-sixty-seven preservice primary and secondary school teachers within New South Wales were studied across four University Campuses. Five kinds of instruments were administered to the subjects of the study: a demographic questionnaire, an attributional vignettes questionnaire, an attitudes questionnaire, a teacher efficacy scale questionnaire, and, an instructional strategies questionnaire. Each University within New South Wales is required, by the Department of Education and Training (DET), to include a compulsory inclusive education subject within their course design. To investigate the influence that the compulsory inclusive education subject has on preservice teachers, the study included preservice teachers who had and had not completed the subject.

The results of the study showed that preservice teachers form a negative attribution cycle about students with a learning disability, which is in stark contrast to the positive attribution cycle that they form about students without a learning disability. The findings show that preservice teachers view students with a learning disability more from a medical model viewpoint that emphasises deficits. Thus, they are generally more positive towards students with a learning disability, less frustrated, more sympathetic, and have lower expectations of their future performances.

Philosophically, their educational view towards students with a learning disability is driven by ability, rather than effort, which is in contrast to their view towards students without a learning disability. Preservice teachers also report they would use more teacher-centred instructional strategies for students with learning disabilities, in comparison to using higher cognitive level instructional strategies in a student-centred environment for students without a learning disability. The application of teacher efficacy to this study suggested that preservice teachers who believed, and were confident in their own teaching abilities, were more likely to have a greater academic focus on classroom instructional strategies and outcomes. Similarly, preservice teachers with a greater positive attitude towards students with a learning disability had higher expectations of these students and reported greater use of higher cognitive level instructional strategies in a student-centred environment.

Finally, the study suggests recommendations and implications for practice and future research in regards to understandings and expectations of students with learning disabilities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY	III
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	IV
ABSTRACT	V
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XV
LIST OF FIGURES	XVII
LIST OF TABLES	XIX
LIST OF TABLES	XIX
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	2
1.3 LOCATION OF THE STUDY	3
1.3.1 The Sites	3
1.3.2 Participants	4
1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	4
1.5 THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTION TO PRACTICE	5
1.6 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS	8

CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW	10
2.1 INTRODUCTION	10
2.2 LEARNING DISABILITIES	11
2.2.1 Overview	11
2.2.2 Historical Background of LD	12
2.2.2.1 Historical Work in the Field of LD	12
2.2.2.2 Defining and Understanding LD	14
2.2.2.3 Identifying LD	18
2.2.2.4 Current Trends in Australia	19
2.2.3 Prevalence of LD	23
2.3 ATTRIBUTION THEORY	23
2.3.1 Some Important Principles of Attribution Theory	24
2.3.1.1 Self Perceptions	25
2.3.1.2 Process Underlying an Attribution	26
2.3.1.3 Factors Relating to Attribution Theory	26
2.3.2 Motivational Dimensions in Attribution Theory	27
2.3.3 Relationship between the Attributional Model and Achievement-Related Behaviour	29
2.4 AN ATTRIBUTIONAL APPROACH TO ACHIEVEMENT OUTCOMES	30
2.4.1 Attributions Teachers Have About Students	31
2.4.2 How Teacher Attribution Affects Actions toward Students	32
2.4.3 Attributional Messages and Student Performance	34
2.4.4 Academic Achievement of Students with LD	37
2.4.5 Teacher Attribution and LD as a Cause for Failure	39
2.5 EXPECTANCY-VALUE THEORIES OF MOTIVATION	44
2.6 ATTITUDES TOWARD STUDENTS WITH LD	47
2.6.1 Role of Beliefs	47
2.6.2 Factors Influencing Teachers' and Preservice Teachers' Attitudes toward Students with Special Educational Needs	48

2.6.3 Teachers' and Preservice Teachers' Attitudes toward Students with LD	52
2.6.4 Attitude Summary	54
2.7 SOCIAL COGNITIVE THEORY	55
2.7.1 Some Important Principles of Social Cognitive Theory	56
2.7.1.1 Self-Efficacy Beliefs	58
2.7.1.2 How Self-Efficacy Beliefs are Formed	59
2.7.1.3 How Self-Efficacy Beliefs Influence Human Functioning	60
2.7.2 Basic Concepts in Teachers' Self-Efficacy	60
2.7.2.1 Development of Teacher Efficacy	62
2.7.2.2 Factors Affecting Teacher Efficacy	63
2.8 THE INFLUENCE OF TEACHERS' EFFICACY BELIEFS	64
2.8.1 Beliefs Concerning the Causes	64
2.8.2 Teacher Efficacy Relating to Students with LD	65
2.8.3 Efficacy, Beliefs and Classroom Strategies	67
2.9 TEACHER RESPONSE	68
2.9.1 Teacher Response to Efficacy, Expectancy and Student Achievement	68
2.9.2 Teacher Response to LD	69
2.10 MISDIAGNOSING STUDENTS' POTENTIAL TO LEARN	71
2.11 SUMMARY	73
2.11.1 Gaps in the Research	74
CHAPTER 3 – METHODOLOGY	77
3.1 INTRODUCTION	77
3.2 PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH STUDY	78
3.2.1 Research Study Hypotheses	79
3.3 POPULATION AND SAMPLE	80
3.3.1 Population	81

3.3.2	Sample	83
3.4	RESEARCH DESIGN	83
3.5	DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS	84
3.5.1	Section One: Demographic Questions	85
3.5.2	Section Two: Attributional Vignettes Questionnaire	85
3.5.2.1	Scoring	88
3.5.2.2	Development, Reliability and Validity of the Attributional Vignettes Questionnaire	88
3.5.2.3	Recent Research with the Vignettes Questionnaire	89
3.5.3	Section Three: Attitude Questionnaire	90
3.5.3.1	Scoring	90
3.5.3.2	Development, Reliability and Validity of the Survey of Practices with Students of Varying Needs	91
3.5.4	Section Four: Teacher Efficacy Scale Questionnaire	91
3.5.4.1	Scoring	92
3.5.4.2	Development, Reliability and Validity of the Teacher Efficacy Scale	92
3.5.4.3	Recent Research with the Teacher Efficacy Scale	94
3.5.5	Section Five: Instructional Strategies Questionnaire	96
3.5.5.1	Scoring	96
3.5.5.2	Development, Reliability and Validity of the Instructional Strategies Questionnaire	96
3.5.5.3	Recent Research with the SOP and DPS	97
3.6	DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE	97
3.6.1	Approval	97
3.6.1.1	Human Experimentation Ethics Committee (University of Wollongong)	98
3.6.1.2	Heads of the Faculties of Education at each University	98
3.6.1.3	Participants' Permission	98
3.6.2	Pilot Study	99
3.6.3	Administration of Instrument	99

3.7	DATA ANALYSIS	100
3.7.1	Data Coding	100
3.7.1.1	Demographic Questions	100
3.7.1.2	Attributional Vignettes Questions	101
3.7.1.3	Attitude Questions	102
3.7.1.4	Teacher Efficacy Questions	103
3.7.1.5	Instructional Strategies Questions	104
3.7.2	Missing Data and Outliers	104
3.7.3	Data Normality	107
3.7.4	Data Sample Comparisons	109
3.7.5	Data Consolidation	110
3.7.6	Analysis Design	113
3.7.6.1	Stages of Analysis	113
3.7.6.1.1	Statistical Protocols Relating to Each Hypothesis	116
3.7.6.2	Structural Equation Modelling	120
3.7.6.2.1	Data Preparation for the SEM	121
3.7.6.2.2	The Conceptual Model	123
3.7.6.2.3	The Development of the Measurement Models	124
3.7.6.2.4	The Development of the Structural Models	124
3.7.6.2.5	Post-Hoc Analysis	126
3.8	CHAPTER SUMMARY	126
CHAPTER 4	– RESULTS	128
4.1	INTRODUCTION	128
4.2	CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE	129
4.2.1	Composition of Sample by Gender	129
4.2.2	Composition of Sample by Age	130
4.2.3	Composition of Sample by LD Experience	131
4.2.4	Composition of Sample by Completion of Inclusive Education	131
4.3	ATTRIBUTIONAL VIGNETTE RESPONSES	132
4.3.1	Feedback	134

4.3.2	Frustration	137
4.3.3	Sympathy	140
4.3.4	Expectancy of Future Failure	143
4.3.5	Brief Summary of Attributional Vignette Responses	146
4.4	ATTITUDES	148
4.4.1	Influence of Inclusive Education on Attitudes	152
4.5	TEACHER EFFICACY	154
4.5.1	Influence of Inclusive Education on Teacher Efficacy	157
4.6	INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES	158
4.6.1	Influence of Inclusive Education on Instructional Strategies	161
4.6.2	Instructional Strategies for Students with LD in Comparison to Students without LD	163
4.6.2.1	Differences Amongst the Higher Cognitive Level Instructional Strategies	163
4.6.2.2	Individual Instructional Strategies used with the Greatest of Differences	164
4.6.2.3	Instructional Strategies used with No Differences	166
4.6.2.4	Instructional Strategies used More Frequently with Students with LD	167
4.6.3	LD Attitude and Instructional Strategies	168
4.7	ATTITUDE AND EFFICACY CORRELATIONS	170
4.8	EFFECTS OF ATTITUDES AND TEACHER EFFICACY ON ATTRIBUTIONAL RESPONSES	171
4.8.1	Effects of LD Attitudes on Attributional Responses	172
4.8.2	Effects of Differentiation Attitudes on Attributional Responses	173
4.8.3	Effects of General Teacher Efficacy on Attributional Responses	174
4.8.4	Effects of Personal Teacher Efficacy on Attributional Responses	175
4.9	STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELLING	175
4.9.1	Maximum Likelihood Estimation Method	176
4.9.2	Measurement Fit of the Model	176

4.9.3	Model Modification	180
4.10	STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODEL DEVELOPMENT	181
4.10.1	Development of the Measurement Models	181
4.10.1.1	Measurement Model One	182
4.10.1.2	Measurement Model Two	183
4.10.1.3	Measurement Model Three	185
4.10.1.4	Measurement Model Four	186
4.10.1.5	Measurement Model Five	188
4.10.1.6	Measurement Model Six	189
4.10.1.7	Reliability of Measurement Models	191
4.10.2	Development of the Structural Models	192
4.10.2.1	Combined Model	192
4.10.2.2	Structural Equation Model One	194
4.10.2.3	Structural Equation Model Two	197
4.10.2.4	Structural Equation Model Three	200
4.10.2.5	The Overall Fit of the Model	202
4.10.2.5.1	Absolute Fit Measures	202
4.10.2.5.2	Incremental Fit Measures	203
4.10.2.5.3	Parsimonious Fit Measures	203
4.10.2.6	Post-Hoc Model Fitting	203
4.10.2.6.1	Fit of Model Using GLS Estimation	204
4.10.2.6.2	A Cross-Validation Analysis Using Sample Two.	206
4.11	EXAMINATION OF THE CRITICAL RATIOS	208
4.11.1	Critical Ratios to LD Instructional Strategies	209
4.11.2	Critical Ratios to Attributional Responses toward Students with LD	209
4.11.2.1	Feedback	210
4.11.2.2	Frustration	210
4.11.2.3	Sympathy	211
4.11.2.4	Expectation of Future Failure	211
4.12	GROUP COMPARISON (INCLUSIVE EDUCATION)	212

4.13	STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODEL SUMMARY	214
4.14	CHAPTER SUMMARY	215
	CHAPTER 5 – DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	216
5.1	INTRODUCTION	216
5.2	GENERAL OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS	217
5.2.1	Attributions	217
5.2.1.1	Summary Discussion	224
5.2.2	Attitudes	226
5.2.3	Teacher Efficacy	228
5.2.4	Instructional Strategies	229
5.2.5	Structural Equation Modelling	232
5.3	CONCLUSIONS ON HYPOTHESES	234
5.3.1	Hypothesis 1 Testing	234
5.3.2	Hypothesis 2 Testing	237
5.3.3	Hypothesis 3 Testing	238
5.3.4	Hypothesis 4 Testing	240
5.3.5	Hypothesis 5 Testing	241
5.3.6	Hypothesis 6 Testing	242
5.4	LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	245
5.5	RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS	247
5.5.1	Implications for Practice	247
5.5.2	Implications for Future Research	251
5.6	CONCLUSION	253
	REFERENCE LIST	259
	APPENDICES	

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACLD	Association for Children with Learning Disabilities
ADHD	Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder
ALDA	Australian Learning Disability Association
AMOS	Analysis of MOment Structures
AUSPELD	Australian Federation of Specific Learning Difficulties Associations
BD	Behaviour Disorders
CEEBI	Character Education Efficacy Belief Instrument
CFI	Comparative Fit Index
CMIN/DF	Ratio of Minimum Discrepancy to Degrees of Freedom
CR	Critical Ratio
CSU	Charles Sturt University
DET	Department of Education and Training
df	Degrees of Freedom
Diff Att	Attitudes towards Differentiation
DPS	Differentiated Practices Survey
DV	Dependent Variable
GLS	Generalised Least Squares
GTE	General Teacher Efficacy
ISQ	Instructional Strategies Questionnaire
IV	Independent Variable
LD	Learning Disability
LD Att	Attitudes towards Students with a Learning Disability
LDFailFS	Independent Dimension Variable with Factor Loadings for Expectation of Future Failure towards Students with LD.
LDFeedFS	Independent Dimension Variable with Factor Loadings for Feedback Given to Students with LD.
LDFrustFS	Independent Dimension Variable with Factor Loadings for Frustration towards Students with LD.

LD Strat	Higher Cognitive Level Instructional Strategies for Students with LD
LDSympFS	Independent Dimension Variable with Factor Loadings for Sympathy towards Students with LD.
MANOVA	Multivariate Analysis of Variance
MI	Modification Indices
ML	Maximum Likelihood
MQU	Macquarie University
η^2	Partial Eta Squared
NACHC	National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children
NJCLD	National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities
NLD	Non-Learning Disability
NRCGT	National Research Centre for the Gifted and Talented
NSW	New South Wales
PGFI	Parsimonious Goodness-of-Fit Index
PTE	Personal Teacher Efficacy
RMSEA	Root Mean-Square Error of Approximation
RMSR	Root Mean Squared Residual
SEM	Structural Equation Model
SIPFQ	Social Interaction Program Features Questionnaire
SOP	Survey Of Practices (Instrument)
SPSS	Statistical Program for the Social Sciences
SRMSR	Standardised Root Mean Squared Residual
SRW	Standardised Regression Weight
TAS	Teacher Attribute Survey
TES	Teacher Efficacy Scale
TLI	Tucker-Lewis Index
TSES	Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale
UOW	University of Wollongong
VET	Vocational Education and Training
χ^2	Chi Square

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.7.6.2. <i>Hypothesised SEM Model from Theoretical Research</i>	125
Figure 4.2.1. <i>Gender Characteristics</i>	129
Figure 4.2.2. <i>Age Characteristics</i>	130
Figure 4.2.3. <i>LD Experience Characteristics</i>	131
Figure 4.2.4. <i>Inclusive Education</i>	132
Figure 4.3.1. <i>Preservice Teachers' Feedback to Students</i>	135
Figure 4.3.2. <i>Preservice Teachers' Frustrations towards Students</i>	138
Figure 4.3.3 <i>Preservice Teachers' Sympathy towards Students</i>	141
Figure 4.3.4 <i>Preservice Teachers' Expectations of Future Failure of Students</i>	144
Figure 4.3.5 <i>LD. Status Influence on Attributional Responses</i>	147
Figure 4.10.1. <i>Measurement Model One. LD Attitude</i>	182
Figure 4.10.2. <i>Measurement Model Two. Differentiation Attitude</i>	183
Figure 4.10.3. <i>Measurement Model Three. General Teacher Efficacy</i>	185
Figure 4.10.4. <i>Measurement Model Four. Personal Teacher Efficacy</i>	186
Figure 4.10.5. <i>Measurement Model Five. LD Instructional Strategies</i>	188
Figure 4.10.6. <i>Measurement Model Six. Attributional Responses toward Students with LD</i>	190
Figure 4.10.8. <i>Combined Model: Attitude and Teacher Efficacy</i>	192
Figure 4.10.9a. <i>Initial Input Structural Equation Model One. Attitude, Efficacy and Instructional Strategies</i>	194
Figure 4.10.9b. <i>Structural Equation Model One. Attitude, Efficacy and Instructional Strategies</i>	195
Figure 4.10.10a. <i>Initial Input Structural Equation Model Two. Attitude, Efficacy and Attributional Responses toward Students with LD</i>	197
Figure 4.10.10b. <i>Structural Equation Model Two. Attitude, Efficacy and Attributional Responses toward Students with LD</i>	198
Figure 4.10.11a. <i>Initial Input Structural Equation Model Three. Full SEM Model of Attitude, and Teacher Efficacy toward Attributional Responses and Instructional Strategies to Students with LD</i>	200

Figure 4.10.11b. <i>Structural Equation Model Three. Full SEM Model of Attitude, and Teacher Efficacy toward Attributional Responses and Instructional Strategies to Students with LD.</i>	201
Figure 5.2.1. <i>Feedback (Ability)</i>	218
Figure 5.2.2. <i>Feedback (Effort)</i>	218
Figure 5.2.3. <i>Frustration (Effort)</i>	219
Figure 5.2.4. <i>Sympathy (Ability)</i>	220
Figure 5.2.5. <i>Sympathy (Effort)</i>	221
Figure 5.2.6. <i>Expectation of Future Failure (Ability)</i>	222
Figure 5.2.7. <i>Expectation of Future Failure (Effort)</i>	222
Figure 5.2.8. <i>Main effects of Expectation of Future Failure</i>	224

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.5.1 A Matrix of Two by Two by Two Vignettes	87
Table 3.7.1 Recoding of the Feedback Scores	102
Table 3.7.2 Recoding of the Personal Teacher Efficacy Statements	103
Table 3.7.3 Skewness and Kurtosis of Variables.....	108
Table 3.7.4: Logistic Regression Results for Vignette Responses	109
Table 3.7.6 Number and Percentage of Respondents used for Each MANOVA.....	119
Table 3.7.6.2: Reliability from the Individual Factor Variables.....	123
Table 4.3 Overall Multivariate Tests	133
Table 4.3.1. Preservice Teachers' Feedback to Boys with and without LD.....	134
Table 4.3.2. Preservice Teachers' Frustration Felt towards Boys with and without LD	137
Table 4.3.3. Preservice Teachers' Sympathy Felt towards Boys with and without LD	140
Table 4.3.4. Preservice Teachers' expectations of Future Failure towards Boys with and without LD.....	143
Table 4.4 Significant Comparisons of Attitudes towards Students with LD and Differentiating the Curriculum	149
Table 4.4.1 Influence of Inclusive Education Completion on Attitudes towards Students with LD and Differentiation	152
Table 4.5 Significant Comparisons of General and Personal Teacher Efficacy	155
Table 4.5.1 Influence that Inclusive Education Completion has on General and Personal Teacher Efficacy	158
Table 4.6 Significant Comparisons of Frequency of use of Instructional Strategies.....	160
Table 4.6.1 Influence that Inclusive Education Completion has on Frequency of use of Instructional Strategies.....	162
Table 4.6.2.1 Comparison of Frequency Rates for Use of Higher Cognitive Level Instructional Strategies For Students with and without LD	163

Table 4.6.2.2 Strategies with the Greatest of Differences of Usage between Students with and without LD	164
Table 4.6.2.2.1 Ranking of the Higher Cognitive Level Instructional Strategies used towards Students with and without LD.....	165
Table 4.6.2.3 Strategies used with No Significant Differences of Usage between Students with and without LD	166
Table 4.6.2.4 Strategies used More Frequently towards Students with LD in Comparison to Students without LD	167
Table 4.6.3 Significant Differences between Higher Cognitive Level Instructional Strategies used with Preservice Teachers with High (Positive) and Low (negative) Attitudes towards Students with LD	168
Table 4.6.3.1 Significant Differences between Instructional Strategies used with Preservice Teachers with High (Positive) and Low (negative) Attitudes towards Students with LD.....	169
Table 4.7.1 Overview of Correlations between the Scale Variables	170
Table 4.8 Number of Respondents used in the MANOVAs.....	172
Table 4.8.1 Differences Amongst Preservice Teachers with High (Positive) and Low (Negative) Attitudes towards Students with LD	172
Table 4.8.2 Differences Amongst Preservice Teachers with High (Positive) and Low (Negative) Attitudes towards Differentiating the Curriculum	173
Table 4.8.3 Differences Amongst Preservice Teachers with High and Low General Teacher Efficacy	174
Table 4.8.4 Differences Amongst Preservice Teachers with High and Low Personal Teacher Efficacy	175
Table 4.9.2: Fit Indices and Acceptance Levels that this Study used.....	179
Table 4.10.1: Measurement Model One Statistics	183
Table 4.10.2: Measurement Model Two Statistics	184
Table 4.10.3: Measurement Model Three Statistics	186
Table 4.10.4: Measurement Model Four Statistics	187
Table 4.10.5: Measurement Model Five Statistics.....	189
Table 4.10.6: Measurement Model Six Statistics	190
Table 4.10.7: Reliability of Measurement Models	191
Table 4.10.8: Combined Model Statistics.....	193

Table 4.10.9: Structural Model One Statistics	196
Table 4.10.10: Structural Model Two Statistics	199
Table 4.10.11: Structural Model Three Statistics	201
Table 4.10.12: Structural Model Three Statistics Using GLS Estimation.....	204
Table 4.10.13: Structural Model Three Statistics Sample Data Set Two	206
Table 4.11.1: Critical Ratios of Final SEM	208
Table 4.12.1: Critical Ratios between Completion and non-Completion of the Compulsory Inclusive Education Subject.	213
Table 5.3.3 Impact Inclusive Education Training has on Preservice Teachers	239